

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 22 and 24-42 remain in the application. Claims 22 and 24-42 are subject to examination. Claim 22 has been amended.

An RCE has been filed concurrently with this amendment.

Under the heading "Specification" on page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner reminded applicants of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

A new abstract on a separate sheet has been provided on page 2 of this paper. Please replace the old abstract with the new abstract.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 4 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 22, 24-35, and 37 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,920,505 to Hals et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,966,029 to Ahern and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,194,683 to Hind et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claim 22 has been amended based on the Examiner's comments.

In the Response to Arguments section, the Examiner stated that applicant did not define the window and object parameters in order to further define the claim

language and to narrow down the inventive steps. Claim 22 has been amended to further define the window and object parameters. Claim 22 now specifies that the window and object parameters include X and Y coordinates of objects being displayed. Support for the changes can be found by referring to the specification at page 14, last paragraph.

Claim 22 now specifies that prior to being sent to the client computer, the screen displays that are transmitted to the client computer are generated on the server computer using a window program routine of the operating system on the server computer based on window and object parameters and that the window and object parameters include X and Y coordinates of objects being displayed.

Generating screen displays using a window program routine of the server computer based on window and object parameters, including X and Y coordinates of objects being displayed, clearly excludes HTML-based systems.

Hind et al. discloses a method for authoring dynamic data (i.e. JavaScript) included in a HTML document. Hals et al. teach a method for determining a navigation path for a visitor to a Website. Both Hind et al. and Hals et al. are clearly related to a Website that is based on HTML code. This HTML code does not include the X and Y coordinates of objects being displayed. Rather, the HTML code is interpreted by the browser. Importantly, it is the browser that determines the actual X and Y coordinates of the objects being displayed.

Therefore, even if there were a suggestion to combine the teachings of Hind et al. and Hals et al. with the teaching of Ahern, the invention as defined by claim 22 would not have been obtained.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 13 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 36 and 38-42 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,920,505 to Hals et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,966,029 to Ahern, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,194,683 to Hind et al., and further in view of Published U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0165993 A1 to Kramer under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Even if there were a suggestion to combine the teaching of Kramer with that of Hals et al., Ahern, and Hind et al., the invention as defined by claims 36 and 38-42 would not have been obtained for the reasons given above with regard to claim 22.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 22. Claim 22 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 22.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 22 and 24-42 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for response within a period of three months pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of \$555.00 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

Please charge any other fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stermer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Laurence A. Greenberg/
Laurence A. Greenberg
(Reg. No. 29,308)

MPW:cgm

November 20, 2008

Lerner Greenberg Stermer LLP
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101